

March 20, 1975

per prisoner per year, would be over \$78 billion. Of course, this is simply not practicable, yet equal application of the law would demand such action.

A survey taken by the Drug Abuse Council shows a narrow margin between the number of adults who favor reducing criminal penalties and those who favor imposing stiffer ones. Thirty-nine percent favor the elimination of criminal penalties for the sale and/or possession of small amounts of marijuana, and private use of it, while 40 percent believe there should be tougher laws for possession of small amounts. Only 13 percent favor retaining the present laws. Progressive legislation is much slower in evolving on this issue than are attitudes of the American public. Some progress is being made however. In October of 1973 Oregon became the first State to remove all criminal sanctions for marijuana possession. Their new law classified possession of up to 1 ounce of marijuana as a "civil violation" rather than a criminal act, with a maximum penalty of a \$100 fine. The Ford Foundation commissioned a survey to determine how the new law was working in Oregon after 1 year. It determined:

First, there has been no significant increase in persons smoking marijuana in Oregon;

Second, those who do smoke marijuana actually reported a decrease in usage—40 percent reported a decrease and only 5 percent an increase;

Third, Oregonians strongly support the decriminalization approach—58 percent approve of the new law, only 39 percent favor strong penalties.

The New Jersey Prosecutors Association recently reported a resolution regarding the prosecution of marijuana offenses. It removes criminal penalties for the possession of any amount of marijuana, and instead treats this possession as a "disorderly persons offense," carrying a maximum sentence for the first conviction of a fine of \$500 and for any subsequent conviction a maximum sentence of 6 months and/or a fine of \$500. The New Jersey Prosecutors' Association Committee to Study Prosecution of Marijuana Offenses resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

The Senate and Assembly of the State of New Jersey have undertaken study and review of the "New Jersey Controlled Dangerous Substances Act". Because of this interest and because the prosecutor's role as chief law enforcement officer of the County dictates that the prosecutors of New Jersey engage in a continual review of law enforcement priorities and practices, the New Jersey Prosecutors Association, on January 31, 1975 appointed a committee to study and draft recommendations concerning the prosecution of marijuana offenses in New Jersey.

That committee has completed its study and has proposed recommendations contained in a report annexed hereto, and made a part thereof.

Now, therefore be it resolved that the report of the aforesaid committee be accepted and approved and the following recommendations be and are adopted by the New Jersey Prosecutors Association:

1. That possession of marijuana be classified as a disorderly persons offense carrying a maximum sentence for the first conviction of a fine of not more than \$500.00 and for any subsequent conviction a maximum

sentence of 6 months and/or a fine of not more than \$500.00.

2. That possession of marijuana with intent to distribute be classified as a misdemeanor carrying a maximum sentence of 5 years and/or a fine of not more than \$25,000.00.

3. That distribution of marijuana be classified as a misdemeanor carrying a maximum sentence of 5 years and/or a fine of not more than \$25,000.00.

4. That the same provisions respectively also apply to the offenses of possession of hashish, possession of hashish with intent to distribute and distribution of hashish.

Although the New Jersey proposal does not decriminalize personal use and possession to the extent my legislation does, it is a progressive piece of legislation and a step in the right direction.

On March 10, 1975, I introduced H.R. 4520 known as the Javits-Koch bill, with the following 18 cosponsors: Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. JOHN BURTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. NIX, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STARK, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. WAXMAN. If enacted the legislation would decriminalize the personal use and possession of marijuana. The bill was first introduced by Senator JAVITS in the Senate and myself in the House on April 20, 1972. It would remove all penalties for the possession of marijuana for personal use in a private home; it would also allow not-for-profit transfer of marijuana and the possession of reasonable amounts of marijuana in public when such possession is incident to private use. Marijuana smoking in public would continue to be a crime.

The bill "decriminalizes" rather than "legalizes." The Shafer Commission found that "neither the marijuana user nor the drug itself can be said to constitute a danger to public safety," and unanimously recommended the elimination of all criminal penalties against the user. The decriminalization approach has been endorsed by a growing number of respected groups. They include:

The American Bar Association; American Public Health Association; Consumers Union, publishers of Consumer Reports; National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws; National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals; National Council of Churches; the Governing Board of the American Medical Association; National Education Association; Central Conference of American Rabbis; B'nai B'rith; Canadian Commission of Inquiry into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs—Le Dain Commission.

I invite my colleagues to consider cosponsorship of this measure as a reasonable alternative to current law.

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KOCH's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KOCH's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

NEW ROCHELLE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters of New Rochelle, N.Y., is celebrating its 50th anniversary year—50 years of service to the community of New Rochelle and its citizens; "50 years of a unique idea," chapter President Dorothy K. Rosenbaum recently told the chapter's members.

I take great pride in honoring the New Rochelle League in the House of Representatives because it is I who feels honored to represent a group of women whose predecessors were pioneers in the fight for women's rights. The New Rochelle League was founded in late 1924 by, among others, Carrie Chapman Catt who was a New Rochelle resident and president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association. Mrs. Catt was also instrumental in founding the National League of Women Voters in 1920.

The New Rochelle League of Women Voters is the proud owner of two items of historical significance: a gavel used by Carrie Chapman Catt when she was president of NAWSA and presented to the League later by Mrs. Catt, and a receipt for leaflets signed by Susan B. Anthony.

Currently, the New Rochelle League is involved in such important areas as voter registration, housing, urban planning, environmental quality, financing education, and recreation.

I am pleased to recognize the great contributions of the New Rochelle League of Women Voters in this, their 50th anniversary year.

(Ms. ABZUG asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Ms. ABZUG's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY ACT

(Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 1975, the House Education and Labor Committee by a vote of 37 to 0 reported H.R. 46, the Youth Camp Safety Act. This bill is a long overdue first step in insuring the health and safety of over 10 million American youngsters attending approximately 10,000 camps during the summer months.

State laws to safeguard our children in camps are woefully inadequate. More attention is currently given to preserving and protecting wildlife than is focused on the well-being of young people who attend camp.

Today the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. PERKINS, will file the committee's report

March 20, 1975

Approved For Release 2001/11/01 : CIA-RDP76M00527R000700170018-7
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE H 2107

provements but must have Federal assistance in order to be able to engage in the kind of community development activities they must have; and,

Those communities with growth and development potential but which have had no credit resources and must have Federal aid to take advantage of their opportunities.

This \$5-billion program which I am supporting is meant to aid those communities which have credit needs. It would make it possible for communities which are otherwise eligible for Federal assistance under other Federal public works capital improvement programs but cannot obtain that assistance because they do not have the non-Federal funds those programs require. In such cases a grant from the Economic Development Administration can be substituted for the local and/or State funds usually required.

In addition, grants for 100 percent of project costs may be made through this program.

Implementation of an investment program such as this means job creation and will help maintain other jobs threatened by the continued weakening of our economy.

It is my belief that public works capital improvement and investment programs make sound sense in human and economic terms. They have the potential for generating jobs directly and indirectly which can be both short and long term. At the same time, they place in local communities needed capital improvements which can enhance a community's potential for diversified economic, social, and cultural development.

One of the portions of this bill which I want to especially mention here is section 5. This section specifies that the factors of severity of unemployment and the income levels of families in proposed project areas be considered in determining where grants shall be used.

It is my understanding that the most detailed statistics available on the family income levels are those from the 1970 decennial census. These are based on 1969 income figures. The median family income for the United States at that time was \$9,590 and 10.7 percent of the families in the Nation had incomes of less than poverty level.

In Arkansas the median family income for 1969 was \$6,273, or more than \$3,000 less than that for the Nation. And, 22.8 percent of our Arkansas families had incomes of less than poverty level. That figure is more than twice the level for the Nation.

Census data for the 21-county First Congressional District of Arkansas, which I represent, shows that in 19 of those counties between 23.8 and 43.6 percent of the families had incomes of less than poverty level. In 20 of the counties the median family income was less than that for the State, which I have already pointed out was not even two-thirds of the median income level for the whole Nation.

In January and February the unemployment figure for the Nation was 8.2 percent in January. The Arkansas unemployment figure was 9.9 percent. Twenty of the 21 counties in my district had unemployment rates more than 8.2

percent in January. Five had rates between 25 and 49 percent higher than the national rate, six had rates between 50 and 74 percent higher, three had rates between 75 and 99 percent higher, and the rates for two were more than 100 percent higher than the national rate.

In February, Arkansas, through the Ozarks Regional Commission, submitted recommendations to the Secretary of Commerce for more than \$25 million worth of projects to be funded under title X of the Public Works and Economic Development Act. These are very labor intensive. It is my understanding that many more public works capital improvement projects are not planned to the stage that, given funding, they could get underway very quickly.

I have long been committed to working for solutions to our Nation's unemployment problems and to the need for community development in the countryside. This bill I have sponsored today will, I believe, be a major step in that direction.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRINTING HEARINGS ON REGULATIONS RE- GARDING PUBLIC ACCESS TO NIXON PRESIDENTIAL MATERIALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAs) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 19, 1975, the General Services Administration submitted to Congress regulations and an explanatory report regarding public access to the Nixon Presidential materials.

The regulations implement title I of the Presidential Recordings and Materials Preservation Act, signed into law by President Ford on December 19, 1974. Title I of that act provides that the Government: First, retain custody of the Nixon Presidential materials; and second, provides appropriate access to them.

The act give Congress the authority to disapprove of these regulations, by providing in section 105(b) that the regulations take effect 90 legislative days after submission unless they are disapproved by either House of Congress within that period.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is of great public importance and of considerable interest to Members of the House. I would like to announce, therefore, that in April, after the Easter recess, the Subcommittee on Printing will hold hearings to listen to testimony regarding these regulations. If after these hearings it becomes apparent that part or all of the regulations are unsatisfactory, the subcommittee will recommend to the full Committee on House Administration appropriate action to perfect the regulations.

ADJUSTING ALLOWANCES FOR MEMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 457, 92d Congress,

enacted by Public Law 92-184 into permanent law on December 15, 1971, provides the Committee on House Administration the authority to fix and adjust from time to time various allowances of Members, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico or a Delegate to the House of Representatives. Pursuant to this authority the committee has issued Order No. 17 which is effective March 1, 1975.

Committee Order No. 17 modifies and supersedes Committee Order No. 6, but does not increase the \$250 per month allocation of the unused portion of clerk hire allowance previously authorized on May 1, 1973, for the leasing of equipment. Committee Order No. 17 merely expands the authorized use of such \$250 per month allocation to include leasing of computer and related services utilized in connection with a Member's official duties without any increase in the amount of the \$250 allocation as authorized on May 1, 1973:

COMMITTEE ORDER NO. 17

Resolved, That effective March 1, 1975, until otherwise provided by order of the Committee on House Administration, upon written request to the Committee on House Administration, a Member, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico or a Delegate to the House of Representatives may allocate an amount not to exceed \$250 a month of any unused portion of his or her clerk hire allowance for the leasing of equipment necessary for the conduct of his or her office or for the leasing of computer and related services in connection with his or her official duties.

MOVEMENT ON MARIHUANA

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, it is very important that people recognize that not only are arrests for marihuana use and possession continuing, they are growing enormously every year. In the last 4 years 1,127,389 persons in this country have been arrested for marihuana offenses. In 1974 alone 420,700 persons were arrested. Two thirds of the arrests involved amounts of marihuana that were less than 1 ounce. The overwhelming majority of those arrested are young and otherwise law-abiding citizens, but each is faced with the unrelenting burden of a lifelong criminal arrest record. The Shafer Commission found 88 percent of those arrested on marihuana offenses were under 26, and 58 percent were under 21.

The personal human tragedy involved here is great, but it overlaps to affect the rest of the society as well. Nationally, it is estimated that approximately \$600 million is spent annually arresting marihuana smokers. Over 10 percent of all defendants charged in Federal courts in 1973 were charged with marihuana violations. A tremendous amount of valuable police and prosecutorial time and resources are used to prosecute these cases, diverting valuable law enforcement facilities away from the control of serious crime. If we were to place just the 13 million regular users of marihuana in jail for a year, the cost to the American public, at more than \$6,000

Approved For Release 2001/11/01 : CIA-RDP76M00527R000700170018-7